

**This is Docket#04-207**

9/17/2007 10:45:29 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to mmann1019@msn.com.

mmann1019@msn.com wrote on 9/16/2007 12:51:15 AM :

Michael Mann  
1201 Miramont Dr  
Fort Collins, CO 80524-1903

September 16, 2007

Kevin Martin  
FCC Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Kevin Martin:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Michael Mann  
970-416-0894

FILED/ACCEPTED  
OCT 2 - 2007  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

DOCKET 04-207

9/10/2007 10:13:53 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to cdkruse@telebeep.com.

cdkruse@telebeep.com wrote on 9/8/2007 4:54:55 PM :

Dean J./Carol E. Kruse  
2004 No. 26th St  
Norfolk, NE 68701-3347

September 8, 2007

Jonathan Adelstein  
FCC Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I am disgusted to learn that I am being forced to help pay for scenes describing bestiality and other depraved behavior on the FX network's Nip/Tuck with my cable subscription. In the episode that aired on September 26, a plastic surgeon treats a female patient who says her nipple was torn off when she tried to break up a dogfight. She is desperate to have the injury repaired and undetectable before her husband returns from Iraq. The husband returns after the surgery and confronts her in the doctor's office, revealing that she used peanut butter to seduce her dog and implying that her nipple was actually torn off when she was having sex with the dog. It is outrageous that this kind of material is airing on television - period. Nip/Tuck is not my choice, and I don't want it coming into my home. But it is inexcusable for the cable industry to force me to pay for this content with my monthly cable subscription.

The solution is so simple - but so far Congress has done nothing but appease the deep-pocketed cable industry. What about consumers' rights?

Give us cable choice. Offering parents the ability to choose the channels they want, and to pay only for those channels, puts power back in the hands of the consumer - of parents - and forces the producers of indecent or violent programming to fund their own raunch. It is the only fair solution. Why should I be forced to pay for programming that insults my intelligence and assaults my values just to gain access to a handful of channels I can watch with my family. The cable industry has been carried on the backs of American consumers long enough. It is time for this extortion to end.

Sincerely,

Dean J./Carol E. Kruse  
4023718768

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 2 - 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

0

**Docket#04-207**  
**TSR 44**

FILED/ACCEPTED  
OCT 2 - 2007  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

9/13/2007 10:01:01 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to sclaw670@yahoo.com.

sclaw670@yahoo.com wrote on 9/12/2007 12:21:53 PM :

Sean Clawson (sclaw670@yahoo.com) writes:

I have two comments:

1)The reason we will never see free broadband wireless is that the major broadband wireless companies will not release that price-fixed service they have.

b. About time someone sided with the people about ala carte cable channel service please this must be implemented.

Thank you,

Your doing a great job if these two ideas become reality.

thank you

S. Clawson

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

**Docket 04-207**  
**TSR44**

**FILED/ACCEPTED**

**OCT 2 - 2007**

**Federal Communications Commission**  
**Office of the Secretary**

9/14/2007 8:44:24 AM - Email Acknowledgement sent to william.peters@ge.com.

william.peters@ge.com wrote on 9/14/2007 8:20:27 AM :

william a peters III (william.peters@ge.com) writes:

Dear sir,

I am delighted to learn your organization is finally going to address the "tying" of programming from cable and satellite companies! I have 100 channels of which only 15, carry any interest to me. I would like to know if I can assist you in stopping this unfair practice by cable companies. "Ala carte" is the only fair option that should be presented to the public. A program that can not earn the support it needs on it's own merit, should suffer it's own end. Therefore, unwanted programming should not be forced upon the very people companies are supposed to serve and upon who's support, programming depends. In closing, I don't mind paying for programming I want, I just find it unfair to pay for something I don't want or need.

Thank you

Bill Peters

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 192.104.54.5  
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 2 - 2007

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Docket # 04-207**  
**TSR44**

9/16/2007 12:05:32 PM - Email Acknowledgement sent to bobbyhoward@comcast.net.

bobbyhoward@comcast.net wrote on 9/16/2007 12:05:01 PM :

This is not really a complaint as much as a suggestion. I think the FCC should force cable companies to give their customers the option to create their own lineup. I would even be willing to pay more than I currently pay for cable to have this option. What I really do not need is to have to flip through 120 channels to find the 8 I like. I have read the cable industries response to this and I believe they are incorrect. The channels carried by the cable providers make most of their money off of ads so why not force them to receive a portion of the payment of whatever people pay for that channel? Just a thought I thought I would throw out to the FCC. This would also be great to help me keep my kids from viewing channels I do not want them to see. I use the V chip but why not just let me delete the channels I do not want them to see altogether?

Thanks for listening,  
Bobby Howard

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E